

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/812,916	03/31/2004	Masakazu Takahashi	251165US0	5710	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER		
			ROBINSON, KEITH O NEAL		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1638		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/28/2007	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/812,916	TAKAHASHI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Keith O. Robinson, Ph.D.	1638		

	Keith O. Robinson, Ph.D.	1638					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 24 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 106.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet		ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding named or initially rej	octou dianno.	•				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Mewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		<del>II b</del> e entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 14-20</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>8-13</u> .  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		n condition for allowa	nce because:				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
	•						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's amendments and arguments, filed May 24, 2007, do not overcome the rejections as set forth in the previous Office Action mailed January 24, 2007. With regards to the 35 112, first paragraph written description rejection, Applicant argues that "a soybean is a soybean" (see page 7, last paragraph of 'Remarks' filed May 24, 2007); however, Applicant only shows possession of soybean lines QF2F3-1, QF2F3-2 and QF2F3-3 having the claimed traits. See MPEP 2163(I) where it states "[t]o satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc., 325 F.3d 1306, 1319, 66 USPQ2d 1429, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 2003); Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116". Also see MPEP 2163.02 where it states, "[a]n objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement is, "does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed." In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989)". Applicant has not invented each and every soybean plant with the claimed characteristics, but only soybean lines QF2F3-1, QF2F3-2 and QF2F3-3 having the claimed traits. With regards to the 35 112, first paragraph, scope of enablement rejection, Applicant argues that a person skill in the art could have made the claimed soybeans other than soybean lines QF2F3-1, QF2F3-2 and QF2F3-3 (see page 12 of 'Remarks' filed May 24, 2007). This is not persuasive. Given the fact that one of skill in the art cannot reasonably predict the number of segregating genes produced from a cross, it is unclear how one of skill in the art could reasonably predict how to make and use the claimed invention.

DAVID H. KRUSE, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER